REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 3-8, 11-15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho (US 6,307,530) in view of Suenaga (US 4,772,100).

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho in view of Suenaga and Asada et al. (US 5,963,287).

Claims 1, 10 and 15 are apparently objected to due to some perceived informalities.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 4, and 15 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-15 and 17-18 are pending for reconsideration.

Claims Objections

Claims 1, 10 and 15 are objected to due to some informalities. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that use of the term "removable" by claims 1, 10, and 15 is somehow objectionable. However, the Final Office Action again fails to provide any grounds with which to object to the claims. While the original analysis and additional remarks provided by the Examiner are appreciated, Applicant respectfully asserts there is (are) no ground(s) presented by the analysis that would require any amendment to the term "removable." The Examiner's distinction of removable "by a user" or "by a technician" is not relevant to the claim, since no matter who removes the control printed circuit board, the board is removable.

Furthermore, the Office Action indicates that "[a]ppropriate correction is required." However, Applicant is at a loss, without any specific grounds with which to object to use of the term "removable," as how to make an "appropriate correction." Accordingly, unless the

Examiner can provide specific reasoning or logical argument as to why use of the term "removable" in claims 1, 10, and 15 is objectionable, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office Action withdraw the objection, or issue a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, in order to resolve the exact grounds by which use of the term "removable" is ambiguous or indefinite.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3-8, 11-15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho (US 6,307,530) in view of Suenaga (US 4,772,100), and claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho in view of Suenaga and Asada et al. (US 5,963,287). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recites in amended independent claims 1 and 15, and hence dependent claims 3-14, 17, and 18.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display module including, in part, a first frame and a control printed circuit board, "wherein the first frame has at least one first coupling segment and at least one second coupling segment to hold, respectively, opposing edge surfaces of the control printed circuit board." Similarly, independent claim 15 recites a liquid crystal display device including, in part, source and control printed circuit boards, "wherein the control printed circuit board is removable from the source printed circuit board and includes a plurality of notches disposed on opposing side edges of the control printed circuit board."

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention and the Office Action, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho fails to teach or suggest anything with regard to a first frame and a control

printed circuit board, "wherein the first frame has at least one first coupling segment and at least one second coupling segment to hold, respectively, opposing edge surfaces the control printed circuit board" as required by amended independent claim 1. Similarly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho fails to teach or suggest anything with regard to a liquid crystal display device including, in part, source and control printed circuit boards, "wherein the control printed circuit board is removable from the source printed circuit board and includes a plurality of notches disposed on opposing side edges of the control printed circuit board," as required by amended independent claim 15. Although the Office Action alleges that "[t]he circuit boards have notches (Figures 1 and 3 for example)," Cho discloses *nothing* with regard to notches in either FIGs. 1 or 3 "disposed on opposing side edges of the control printed circuit board," as required by amended independent claim 15. Furthermore, although Cho may disclose the use of screws and bolts to attached corner portions of the interface board 10 and the main PCB 11, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho discloses *nothing* with regard to a frame that holds, or even makes physical contact with opposing side edges of either the interface board 10 or the main PCB 11.

In addition, independent claim 1, as amended, recites that "the control printed circuit board and the liquid crystal panel are disposed on opposite sides of the first frame." In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention and acknowledged by the Office Action, Cho explicitly discloses, in FIGs. 1-4, that the rear and front cases 2 and 3 are an outermost case that covers all the internal elements of the LCD monitor including the printed circuit boards 11, 12, and 13, and the liquid crystal panel 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho fails to teach or suggest that any of the printed circuit boards 11, 12, and 13 and the liquid crystal panel 1 are "disposed on opposite sides of the first frame," as required by amended independent claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action does not rely upon Suenaga and/or Asada et al. to remedy the above-identified deficiences of Cho. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action cannot rely upon Suenaga and/or Asada et al. to remedy the above-identified deficiences of Cho since Suenaga and Asada et al. are both completely silent with regard to a first frame and a control printed circuit board, "wherein the first frame has at least one first coupling segment and at least one second coupling segment to hold, respectively, opposing edge surfaces of the control printed circuit board, and the control printed circuit board and the liquid crystal panel are disposed on opposite sides of the first frame," as required by amended independent claim 1. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action cannot rely upon Suenaga and/or Asada et al. to remedy the above-identified deficiences of Cho since Suenaga and Asada et al. are both completely silent with regard or to a liquid crystal display device including, in part, source and control printed circuit boards, "wherein the control printed circuit board is removable from the source printed circuit board and includes a plurality of notches disposed on opposing side edges of the control printed circuit board," as required by amended independent claim 15.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of the applied prior art references, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited by independent claims 1 and 15, and hence dependent claims 3-14, 17, and 18.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____

David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: November 10, 2005

Customer Number: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-739-3000